

233 South Wacker Drive Suite 800, Sears Tower Chicago, IL 60606

312-454-0400 (voice) 312-454-0411 (fax) www.cmap.illinois.gov

To: Human Services Committee

Date: November 5, 2008

From: Bob Dean, Principal Regional Planner

Re: Update on GO TO 2040 and Chicago Community Trust Partnership

At the November 10 meeting, staff will provide an overall update on what has been accomplished in the *GO TO 2040* plan and what the current and immediately upcoming steps are. This memo will describe current activities in two important areas: the partnership with the Chicago Community Trust in addressing human and community development issues; and the approach to human services within the scenario planning process.

Chicago Community Trust partnership

As has been described at past committee meetings, CMAP and the Trust are seeking to use the *GO TO 2040* planning process to address topics beyond the normal reach of regional planning agencies. To do this, the Trust has contracted with a number of organizations with expertise in different areas to lead this effort.

These are listed below, by topic. For each, the CMAP staff liaison is also listed. Committee members with questions about the work in any subject are asked to contact the CMAP liaison, who will direct the question appropriately.

Education (broken into early childhood, K-12, and higher education)

Lead agencies, early childhood: Illinois Action for Children; Ounce of Prevention; Voices for Illinois Children

Lead agency, K-12: UIC School of Education and Great Cities Institute

Lead agency, higher education: U of I Institute for Government and Public Affairs

CMAP contact: Shana Alford, 312-386-8619, salford@cmap.illinois.gov

Health

Lead agency: UIC School of Public Health

CMAP contact: Russell Pietrowiak, 312-386-8798, rpietrowiak@cmap.illinois.gov

Arts and Culture

Lead agency: Illinois Arts Alliance

CMAP contact: Drew Williams-Clark, 312-386-8770, awilliamsclark@cmap.illinois.gov

Food Systems and Hunger Prevention

Lead agencies (food systems): Chicago Food Policy Advisory Council; City of Chicago Department of Planning and Development

Lead agencies (hunger prevention): Greater Chicago Food Depository; Northern Illinois Food Bank

CMAP contact: Lee Deuben, 312-386-8623, ldeuben@cmap.illinois.gov

Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness

Lead agencies (public safety): UIC Department of Criminology, Law, and Justice; Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority

Lead agency (emergency preparedness): American Red Cross of Greater Chicago CMAP contact: Stephen Ostrander, 312-386-8696, sostrander@cmap.illinois.gov

Human Relations

Lead agency: Chicago Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law CMAP contact: Lindsay Banks, 312-386-8826, lbanks@cmap.illinois.gov

Workforce Development

Lead agency: Chicago Jobs Council

CMAP contact: Annie Byrne, 312-386-8786, abyrne@cmap.illinois.gov

Each of these groups has assisted with the development of indicators in their area of expertise. Now, each group is working on preparing a report that describes current conditions in their issue area, explores potential recommendations in each area that could be made in the *GO TO* 2040 plan, and analyzes the costs and benefits of these recommendations. A draft outline of these reports is attached to this memo. Reports are scheduled to be completed by late spring 2009.

As these reports are developed, input and feedback from the Human Services committee will be desired. Because of the number of topics being addressed, this clearly cannot occur at just one meeting. Therefore, beginning this winter, CMAP intends to describe the progress of a few topics at each committee meeting. Depending on the topic and the interest of the committee, this will be done by the CMAP liaison, the Trust's project manager for the topic, or a representative of the lead agency. Committee discussion of the topics of greatest interest is requested.

Scenario development and evaluation

The evaluation of alternative future scenarios is an important piece of the *GO TO 2040* planning process. Brief descriptions of the scenarios were presented at a prior committee meeting, and are also listed below. Please note that the purpose of the scenario evaluation process is *not* to select one single scenario that will be adopted in its entirety. Instead, it is meant to allow us to

examine different potential paths that the region could take toward the realization of its vision. Ultimately, the most effective pieces from each one of the scenarios will be chosen and combined into a preferred scenario.

- Scenario 1: This will be a reference scenario, describing what will happen if we continue on our current path. This is produced for the purposes of comparison, and is not meant to be an alternative scenario that would actually be pursued.
- Scenario 2: This scenario focuses on investing in our region's people (or human capital, as economists would say) and preserving our physical environment. The idea is to try to achieve our regional vision while preserving the things that we value most in the region, including open space, affordable housing, historic buildings, etc. This scenario does not have much investment in physical improvements, since we are preserving much of the region as it is, but compensates for this by focusing on education, workforce development, and other human and community development actions. In the human services field, this includes most operational or service-related improvements that could be made, such as more funding for social services staffing or operations.
- Scenario 3: This scenario includes extensive reinvestment in existing infrastructure and places. This focuses our infrastructure investments on existing communities, trying to use existing infrastructure as much as possible. This would lead to community change in some places, unlike scenario 2, which tries to limit this. This scenario features considerable investment in reconstructing and improving our existing transportation and other infrastructure. In the human services field, this scenario would include the provision of new facilities, like community health centers, to meet residents' needs.
- Scenario 4: This scenario relies on technological or innovative policy solutions to reach our vision, including alternative energy sources, advanced transportation technology like real-time transit information, and improved communications capabilities.
 Development would happen across the region in this scenario, but its negative effects would be mitigated by innovative design. In the human services field, an example of a strategy within this scenario would be a regional 211 system.

The inclusion of human services considerations in these scenarios continues to be a challenge. CMAP is currently focusing on quantitative evaluation, which involves analysis of how different strategies would affect the region's land use and housing patterns, transportation system, environmental quality, and overall economy. Human services considerations have been difficult to incorporate into this analysis because of their scale. Few human services activities would have measurable regional impacts on the distribution of people and jobs throughout the region, which is one of the main ways that regional impacts are measured. Similarly, it is difficult to determine how many strategies in other fields would affect human services concerns. To take one example, a regional brownfield remediation program would be expected to shift population and jobs into currently underinvested and low-income

communities. The land use, transportation, and environmental impacts of the brownfield remediation program are possible to estimate, but determining the effect of such a program on the quality of life of a disabled resident of the region (for example) is far more difficult. This would require a level of detail about the hypothetical brownfield remediation program that goes beyond our analytical abilities.

Therefore, staff recommends that the human services impacts of the alternative scenarios be addressed in a primarily qualitative way. This means that once scenarios are fully defined, we will ask how each one would impact the quality of life of a disabled resident of the region, for example. Each scenario will have a distinct land use pattern, transportation system, and economic mix, among other differences. It should be possible to qualitatively examine how these regional systems might impact vulnerable populations or others requiring human services. For example, scenario 3 will feature heavy infill development in existing communities, meaning that more people are in close proximity to needed services; scenario 4 will feature more dispersed development but better use of technology for human services coordination. Each of these will have pluses and minuses that can be analyzed in a non-quantitative but rigorous way.

This method is also being used in some other areas where quantitative evaluation is difficult, such as adaptation to climate change.

Committee discussion of this direction is requested.

ACTION REQUESTED: Information and discussion.